

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is found throughout the specification and in Claims 28 and 30. No new matter has been entered. By this amendment the rejection over Nakai is no longer pertinent, this rejection having been presented only against Claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 23-26. Because Claim 1 is now limited to synthetic resins previously listed in Claims 28 and 30, Nakai is no longer applicable and the rejection over this reference should be withdrawn.

The remaining rejection over Kasahara is traversed.

Kasahara relates to surface-treated calcium carbonate for use in resins, as described in paragraph [0118] of the reference. These resins are described in paragraph [0119] of the reference, cited by the Examiner as disclosing “polyvinylidene chloride copolymers.” While paragraph [0119] of Kasahara recites “vinylidene chloride resins,” Kasahara nowhere discloses polyvinylidene chloride “copolymers.” Rather, paragraph [0119] of the reference, where referring to copolymers, specifically uses the term “copolymers” as in “...ethylene-propylene copolymers, copolymers of ethylene and propylene with other monomers, ...” Moreover, the reference nowhere discloses or suggests Applicants’ particularly claimed synthetic resins selected from a specific group that includes copolymers of vinylidene chloride and vinyl chloride, copolymers of vinylidene chloride and alkyl acrylates, copolymers of vinylidene chloride and alkyl methacrylates, copolymers of vinylidene chloride and acrylic acid, and copolymers of vinylidene chloride and methacrylic acid. In this regard, Kasahara nowhere discloses or suggests, with sufficient specificity, the particularly claimed synthetic resins described in pending Claim 1 herein even with regard to those particular copolymers that include vinylidene chloride.

As discussed in paragraph [0132] of Kasahara, the purpose of the resin compositions therein relate to properties such as joint conformability, weldline strength, etc. This is

demonstrated in paragraph [0156] of the reference where weldlines are formed and tested, etc. Contrary to this purpose, the present invention relates to compositions distinct from those disclosed or suggested in Kasahara useful in producing thin films having good thermal resistance and good oxygen-barrier properties, particularly when made by the blown-film extrusion technique. See specification page 2, lines 1-4. These different objects are realized by the present invention composition in view of its different components, as demonstrated in the present specification.

Because both the components of the present invention composition and optimized performance characteristics thereof are distinct and different as compared with the disclosure in Kasahara, Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure in Kasahara is insufficient to present *prima facie* case of obviousness herein. For this reason Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection, and the passage of this case to Issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Richard L. Treanor  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 36,379

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)